DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 397 FL 025 239

AUTHOR King, Kendall A.
TITLE Inspecting the Unexpected: Language Status and Corpus Shifts as Aspects of Language Revitalization.
PUB DATE 1998-03-00
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Sociolinguistic Symposium 12 (London, England, United Kingdom).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; Contrastive Linguistics; Diachronic Linguistics; Foreign Countries; *Irish; *Language Maintenance; Language Planning; *Language Role; Language Variation; *Maori; *Quechua; *Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Hualapai

ABSTRACT

Drawing on the growing literature on language revitalization initiatives and examples of one Andean initiative in particular, the essay attempts to synthesize some common language corpus and language status transformations that threatened languages undergo during the process of revitalization. Specifically, it looks at the often unexpected changes that have accompanied revitalization initiatives for three well-known threatened languages (Maori, Irish, and Hualapai) and discusses in detail a fourth case, efforts to revitalize Quechua in southern Ecuador. After exploring the commonalities across these contexts, the parallels and contrasts between the processes of language vitalization and language death are considered. Implications for language planners and revitalization advocates are outlined. Contains 43 references. (Author/MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 397

Inspecting the unexpected:

Language status and corpus shifts as aspects of language revitalization

Kendall A. King

New York University

FL025039

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kendall King

1

Drawing from the growing literature on language revitalization initiatives and examples from one Andean initiative in particular, this paper attempts to synthesize what may be some of the common language corpus and language status transformations which threatened languages undergo during the process of language revitalization. Specifically, the paper inspects the often unexpected corpus and status changes which have accompanied revitalization initiatives for three, well-known threatened languages: Maori, Irish and Hualapai, and discusses in detail a fourth case: efforts to revitalize Quichua in southern Ecuador. After exploring the commonalities across these different contexts, the parallels and contrasts between the processes of language revitalization and language death are considered, and lastly, the implications of these findings for language planners and revitalization advocates are discussed.

The status and corpus changes which languages undergo during the process of language death have received substantial academic attention in recent decades. While still not fully understood, scholars have examined the social causes and stages of language death, as well as begun to outline what may be the universal linguistic processes associated with language loss. For example, changes in the language corpus, such as high numbers of borrowed grammatical and lexical items from the (typically more prestigious) contact language (Garzon 1992: 62) and erosion of honorific and referential markers on verbs and nouns (Hill 1983: 265-266) have been well documented. At the status level, language death corresponds with shrinking number and size of domains for use of the threatened language (Hill 1983: 265-271) and ultimately the decline in use of the language at home and the cessation of its inter-generational transmission (Brandt & Ayoungman 1989: 42-46). As over half of the world's estimated 6,000 languages are currently threatened, and many well into the later stages of language death, interested academics have more than ample material for study.

A significant minority of these threatened languages are also the focus of language revitalization initiatives. Efforts to revitalize threatened languages have been undertaken in many locations, with languages as diverse as Cornish of southwest England, the Nunga languages of southern Australia, and Cree in Canada. Yet while numerous individuals and organizations have labored to reverse language shift through a variety of means, few efforts have registered an unqualified success. This is due in part to the difficult nature of language revitalization, but is also related to the lack of knowledge about the common sociolinguistic processes which accompany language revitalization. While many scholars have described various language revitalization efforts in considerable detail (e.g., Spolsky 1989; Maguire 1991; Nobert & Nieto Andrade 1996; King 1997), relatively little academic attention has been directed towards inspecting the inevitable, and often unexpected corpus and status shifts which accompany revitalization efforts.

The present paper addresses this gap in the research. Drawing from the growing literature on language revitalization initiatives and examples from one Andean initiative in particular, this paper attempts to synthesize some of the common, and possibly universal, language corpus and language status transformations threatened languages undergo during the process of language revitalization. In addition, this paper considers how the often unexpected status and corpus changes which frequently accompany language revitalization compare with those that correspond with language death. Such an analysis provides insight into both processes, and in particular, yields information which will prove useful for language revitalization planners and advocates.

Language gain, or positive, societal-level language shift, has been described by a variety of terms (e.g., language renewal, reversing language shift, language revitalization, language revival), and each of these terms in turn has been defined by a number of scholars (see Table 1). Without delving into terminological intricacies of each of these, language revitalization can be defined as an attempt to add new forms or functions to a threatened language with the purpose of increasing its uses or users.[1] This definition allows for the fact that often language revitalization efforts encompass both corpus and status language planning.

Language planning "refers to deliberate efforts to influence behavior of others with respect to the acquisition, structure, or function of their language codes" (Cooper 1989: 43). The field of language planning has traditionally made a distinction between corpus planning and status planning.[2] While status planning refers to activities which attend to the allocation and functions of languages, corpus planning is concerned with the form or structure of languages (Hornberger 1994: 78). In other words, language status planning concerns include the domains or uses of a language; language corpus planning refers to the decisions surrounding the linguistic system

Language revitalization efforts often incorporate both status planning and corpus planning. Language planners working on the behalf of the status of a threatened language may, for example, petition the state to constitutionally recognize the threatened language as a national tongue, hence increasing the possible official domains of use of the language. Concomitantly, revitalization advocates or planners might also focus at the corpus level, for instance, by working to establish a unified script for the unstandardized language.

The goals of language revitalization initiatives, however, are very rarely articulated in such precise language planning terminology. Rather, as language revitalization initiatives are often attempts to restore or reinvigorate the cultural life of the community, they tend to be highly political and emotional endeavors which include a stress on ethnokinship and ethnic identity (re)formation (Fishman 1990: 7). While language revitalization efforts have been described as "attempts to arrive at self-regulated modernization", they are frequently movements which attempt to resurrect what is perceived to be a less corrupt, more authentic version of the modern culture (1990: 9).

An important paradox to be examined here is that language revitalization efforts often have consequences which are near opposite those originally intended by advocates and planners for the threatened language. Indeed, the very nature of language revitalization initiatives brings about significant, often modernizing changes in the threatened languages' status and corpus. In some cases these changes stand in direct conflict with the movements' larger goals.

In what follows, I describe the often unexpected corpus and status changes which have accompanied revitalization initiatives for three well-known, threatened languages: Maori, Irish and Hualapai, and discuss in detail a fourth case: efforts to revitalize Quichua in southern Ecuador. After exploring the aspects of the revitalization process which are shared across these different contexts, I consider the contrasts and continuities between the

processes of language revitalization and language death, and lastly, discuss the implications of these findings for language revitalization planners and advocates.

Language Corpus Shifts

Language revitalization initiatives involve attempts to promote the acquisition and use of the threatened language, typically entailing formal or informal instruction of the language to new or latent speakers. Such instruction often involves use of the written form of the threatened language in the development of texts and other learning materials. It is therefore not surprising that in the early phases of language revitalization efforts typically a basic issue to be resolved is selection of the variety of the language to be taught and used in instructional materials.

In some cases, selection of a standard entails writing down the language for the first time, including developing an orthography and standardizing the lexical and syntactic system. Often this means privileging one dialect over many other existing varieties of the language. In other cases, selection of a standard involves compromising linguistically between several varieties of the language and creating a new formal, written version of the language which shares some features with each of the regional varieties, but is identical to none. In almost all instances, revitalization of the threatened tongue means that the local variety differs from that which has been deemed the standard, and in some regions, results in the subordination of the local variety to an inferior status relative to the standard. As will be made clear below, rarely are corpus issues involving the selection and codification of the variety unproblematic.

For the Hualapai of northwestern Arizona, the development of the nationally recognized bilingual/bicultural Peach Springs education program entailed the creation of a Hualapai language orthography. Prior to this, Hualapai primarily had been an oral language. For the Hualapai school organizers, it was critical that the native speakers and community members hold the key decision making roles in the development of the

Hualapai orthography. With the limited technical assistance of one non-Hualapai linguist, the community members themselves successfully designed the Hualapai orthographic system. However, this process was not without some conflict.

At the time of the development of the Hualapai orthography, the staff of the bilingual program consisted of members from three distinct tribal regions. Members reportedly held different opinions concerning which symbols best represented different sounds.[3] The school staff "recalls countering this situation with humor and a renewed commitment to work toward common goals" and the orthographic disagreements were eventually overcome (Watahomigie & McCarty 1994: 33). The fact remains, however, that standard Hualapai, the version used for instruction and literacy development, is the result of a compromise between three different Hualapai varieties. The version which is used for writing and for instruction, while resembling all of the spoken varieties, is identical to none of them. Nevertheless, the orthographic compromises concerning the Hualapai corpus were successful and seem not to have caused significant problems in program development. Indeed, the Peach Springs school has received national awards for excellence and stands as an educational model for many North American Indian communities.

Other cases of corpus adjustments as part of the process of language revitalization are not so easily resolved. Modern Irish, like Hualapai, also consisted of three main dialects when the spelling and grammar of modern Irish was standardized in the 1950s (de Fréine 1996: 186). Irish revitalization planners sought to establish one unified, standardized variety of Irish in order to assist in the promotion of the language and the development of both Irish literacy and literature. Although compromise between the three dialects was essential for the development of the standard, and was politically perhaps the only feasible option, the result was less than satisfactory. The final product was viewed in the end by many as inauthentic and artificial (Dorian 1994: 485). The artificiality of unified Irish, or what has come to be known as Gaeilge B'l'Ath' (Dublin Irish), has resulted in its

rejection by many Irish speakers on the grounds that it is a stilted, unnatural form of the language (Hindley 1990: 60; in Dorian, 1994: 485). For many speakers, Dublin Irish seems overly complex grammatically, yet lexically and idiomatically impoverished. Gaeilge B'l'Ath' lacks many of the words and expressions which are a familiar and intimate part of the local use of the language in daily, community life; and concomitantly, it contains numerous grammatical items which are strange and unfamiliar to local speakers.

Other threatened language communities, such as the Maori of New Zealand, have avoided standardizing and codifying the endangered language in part to avoid such friction. Kaplan notes that there is "resistance in the Maori community to proposals to develop a standard Maori both because the emergence of a standard normally requires written forms and because various tribal groups speaking different varieties of Maori each believe that their variety is the only 'correct' one" (1994: 16). As a result of this potential for linguistic and political tension, currently, although a written form of Maori exists and despite the fact that there are 154,000 speakers of the language (in a country of 3,618,000), there is no Maori language academy and no standardized, codified Maori (New Zealand Government, 1998). A writing system for Maori using a phonetic alphabet was established by the British in the nineteenth century; and the language was used for a time in British missionary schools (Shafer 1988: 488). Yet in spite (or perhaps because) of this, Maori literacy has not caught on. The limited use of Maori literacy may be due in part to the absence of a standard and the potentially difficult corpus issues its development might entail, but is also likely due to the fact that many of the Maori people still perceive Maori to be essentially an oral language and believe that it should remain so (Kaplan 1994: 16).

Emphasis on the development of oral language skills has in some ways served the Maori revitalization movement well. By far the most successful endeavor has been the *kohanga reos* "language nests" first established in 1982, where pre-schoolers are immersed daily in Maori for three years (Fleras 1982: 79). In the opinion of one expert, "the effect of

the *kohanga reos* cannot be exaggerated"; where in the past only a handful of children arrived to school with any knowledge of Maori, it is now common for thousands to arrive, many of them fluent bilinguals as a result of extensive exposure to the language at the *kohanga reos* (Spolsky 1989: 91).

Yet in spite of the success of the "language nests" and other educational measures at elementary and secondary levels, the number of speakers continues to decline and "the drift towards English in the Maori-speaking communities continues" (1989: 64). If this trend is not reversed, as the number of orally proficient Maori decreases, it seems highly likely that the pressure to instruct and promote the language through written means will only increase. Maori language planners and speakers, as a result, may in the not too distant future be forced to address the complicated issue of which variety to use or which compromises to make in setting the standard.

Similar community dilemmas to those faced by the Irish, Hualapai, and Maori concerning corpus changes are reflected in the case of Quichua revitalization in Saraguro.[4] The Saraguros principally reside in roughly sixty small communities of several hundred people each in the southern Ecuadorian Andes. Numbering approximately 22,000, the Saraguros are part of the Quichua nation, but also constitute an ethnically distinct group, nationally and locally identifiable as such by their clothing and ornate silver jewelry (Belote 1984: 52-60).

Despite the maintenance of a separate indigenous cultural identity, the Saraguros are increasingly Spanish dominant. Although language competencies vary by community, the vast majority of Saraguro children are now Spanish dominant, and many adults of child-bearing age have only aural competence in Quichua. In recent years, among some Saraguros, there has been increasing concern over the dearth of Quichua use and proficiency in the community, and a growing desire to reverse the trend towards Quichua loss and Spanish monolingualism. To this end, a number of Saraguro communities have

established language revitalization programs which instruct Quichua as a second language in their public elementary schools, and some members are making a concerted effort to instruct and use Quichua in their homes and the wider community.

The negotiation over what variety of the language to use for formal instruction took place not in Saraguro, but at the national level. With the technical support of the Indian Education Research Center at the Catholic University of Quito, in 1981, representatives of speakers of the different Ecuadorian varieties of Quichua agreed upon a unified variety of Quichua (Montaluisa 1980; in von Gleich 1994: 96).[5] Quichua language planners attempted to expunge Spanish loan words from the language, either by replacing them with a regional Quichua term or by creating a neologism. While representatives from many areas of the country were included in the unification process, concern has also been expressed that certain regions, namely the province of Imbabura, just north of the capital city, Quito, were over-represented in the meeting and thus exerted disproportionate influence on the unified variety (F. Sarango Macas, personal communication, 4 April 1995).

The creation of *Quichua Unificado* "Unified Quichua" codified the writing system. This major step towards standardization of Quichua was intended to facilitate the acquisition of literacy and the development of Quichua literature, and to contribute to the maintenance and even revitalization of the language. While unified in written form, it was accepted and expected that the regional varieties would continue to vary in their spoken forms (CONAIE 1990: 31-37).

As language revitalization initiatives have developed in Quichua communities, it has become clear that these modifications of the Quichua corpus as part of its standardization are in some ways problematic for revitalization efforts. One such region is Saraguro, where two distinct spoken varieties of the language now co-exist. The Quichua-as-a-second-language pedagogical materials and instructional programs promote the nationally standardized variety of Quichua, Unified Quichua. This stands in direct contrast to what is

locally known as *Quichua auténtico* "authentic Quichua", spoken largely by those who are over sixty and by Saraguros who live in the more remote communities. Because the children and young adults learning Unified Quichua have not mastered the phonological system, nor the lexical particularities of the local variety, these young Saraguros not only learn to read, but to speak Unified Quichua. While mutually intelligible to most, there are alternatively both clashes and gaps in communication between the older and younger Quichua speakers in the communities. The local variety is viewed by the younger generation as corrupted and inferior, and lacking *una buena estructura* "a good structure". Older, 'authentic Quichua' speakers complain, not unlike many Irish users, that the unified variety contains too many formal, unfamiliar grammatical structures and new lexical items to be comprehensible.

Given their perspectives, both generations are correct in their claims. Unified Quichua does contain many words which are either neologisms or Quichua items borrowed from other regional dialects but foreign to Saraguro Quichua speakers. For example, the local, Saraguro 'authentic Quichua' words for "state", "chalkboard" and "car" are the Spanish loan words *estado*, *pizarrón* and *carro*; the unified Quichua words *mamallacta*, *quillcana pirca* and *antahua* are Quichua neologisms, literally translated as "mother place", "writing board" and "metal ant". Unified Quichua also uses grammatical features that 'authentic Quichua' does not. For instance, the morpheme *-ta*, an obligatory object marker, is not regularly used in the local variety. The varieties also differ phonologically. For example, the word for "bread", *tanta*, is pronounced by unified speakers as [tanta] and 'authentic' speakers as [tanda]; *sinca*, "nose", is realized by unified speakers as [sinca] and 'authentic' speakers as [singa] (Fauchois 1988: 59-60; King 1997: 109).

While the linguistic variation between the two varieties may seem minor, the differences are not lost on most Saraguros. Many members, as the comments below suggest, are well aware of the distinction between the two varieties.

> Los mayores usan castellano y quichua; mezclan bastante. Dicen 'chayta presta.' Ahora estamos dando cuenta que no está bien. Yo estoy aprendiendo quichua unificado, no quichua de los mayores.
> (The elders use Spanish and Quichua; they mix considerably. They say, 'lend /S/ this/Q/.' Now we are realizing that it's not good [to do this]. I am learning Unified Quichua, not the Quichua of the elders. /S/) (T 5b: 1-16-95)[6]

> Los de colegio tienen una estructura; los mayores hablan sin su buena estructura.
> (Those from high school have a structure [to their Quichua]; the elders speak without a good structure. /S/) (T 8a: 1-28-95)

The linguistic differences between varieties have hampered revitalization efforts, especially in communities where there are more than a handful of 'authentic Quichua' speakers. Not all teachers, for example, accept student responses in the local variety, while many parents and grandparents resent the instruction of a different variety and the fact that they cannot communicate with the young Quichua learners and cannot linguistically support school Quichua lessons at home.

Saraguro Quichua speakers, like speakers of Hualapai, Irish, and Maori have struggled with the real or possible changes in the corpus of their threatened language as part of the process of revitalization. In three of the four cases discussed above (excluding Maori), revitalization efforts entailed formal instruction, which in turn demanded a written, standardized form of the language. For each group, this process involved or will involve some compromise between different varieties of the language. The standardized form tended to differ substantially from the local variety, used in everyday life. In two of these cases (Irish and Quechua), official and local varieties varied along the same two lines: the standardized variety contained foreign and locally meaningless lexical items and, concomitantly, it had a fuller, more complex grammatical system. For languages undergoing revitalization, such differences between the local and standardized variety may well be common points of difference and possible tension.

In the effort to instruct the language and spread its use to new speakers, the language is formalized and codified, which can serve unexpectedly to remove the language further still from the original speakers and very often raise the issue of which language

variety is truly 'authentic' (see Hornberger & King, to appear). Furthermore, as Dorian (1994: 487-493) notes, tension between speakers of the local variety and the norm (typically an idealized, archaic, or 'purified' form of the language) often hampers efforts to revitalize endangered languages and may hasten language death. These lexical and grammatical changes, however, are only half of the story. While such differences between the local variety and the standardized form may receive the bulk of attention, even more significant transformations take place at the level of language use and language status during the process of language revitalization.

Language Status Shifts

Language revitalization efforts entail attempting to teach and promote the threatened language to new speakers. Initiatives typically serve to bring the language into new, public and formal domains, not only in the classroom, but throughout the community. While perhaps seeming an obvious part of the process, the changes which accompany this instruction and promotion can be both surprising and problematic for language revitalization advocates, as well as the communities in which they work.

In nearly all cases, instruction of the language involves bringing the threatened tongue into the school. Indeed, most revitalization initiatives "have quickly and naturally, almost as a matter of course, moved to emphasize schools and schooling as the central thrust and process" of the entire endeavor (Fishman 1991: 368). Yet the success of language revitalization efforts through formally instructing the threatened language appears to be varied, but generally limited (Hornberger & King 1996: 439; McCarty & Sells Dick 1996: 11-12). Indeed, evidence from dozens of cases around the globe suggests that sole reliance upon the school as the instrument of language revitalization is insufficient for reversing the trend toward loss of the ancestral language.

The emphasis on formal instruction is an aspect of almost all language revitalization initiatives. Efforts to revitalize threatened tongues often have the unexpected effect of

transforming the domains of use of the language. Revitalization initiatives, through instruction and promotion of the language "entail using traditional languages in non-traditional ways. Moving native language instruction and acquisition out of the home and family domain necessarily alters the discourse patterns in which the languages were traditionally embedded and demands that they be used and knowledge of them be displayed in new and non-traditional ways" (Hornberger & King 1996: 440). Language revitalization efforts often, then, result in unexpected changes in language status.

In Ireland, for example, where there is a long history of school instruction of Irish, emphasis on school learning has accompanied the transformation of the domains of use of the language. Beginning in the 1920s, Irish instruction was compulsory throughout the educational system. The ultimate goal at that time was for all instruction to be offered through the medium of Irish, and by the 1950s, more than half of the state schools offered full or partial immersion programs. However, in subsequent years, state support for Irish wavered; the policy requiring Irish as a subject for examinations, for example, was reversed. As state support for the language declined, Irish instruction largely reverted to its previous status as one of many school subjects (Ó Riagáin 1996: 41).

Presently, although there are a limited number of Irish medium immersion schools in operation, the majority of schools teach Irish as a school subject. As a result, "even in parts of the Gaeltacht [traditional strongholds of the language], Irish has become something of a school language" (Benton 1986: 63). After thirteen years of public school instruction, the speaking ability of most students is only moderate, and among a growing minority, negligible (Advisory Planning Committee 1986; cited in Ó Riagáin 1996: 41). Revitalization efforts have strengthened academic knowledge of the language, but in the home and larger community, the language continues to lose ground. Concomitantly, the primary domain of use has shifted from that of the home and family to that of the school and classwork. Thus, as language revitalization efforts have developed in the region, use of

Irish in the public domain has increased, while interaction in the threatened language in the home has declined.

Somewhat similarly, for the Hualapai of Arizona, as Hualapai language competencies declined and domains for use of the language dwindled, the school program carved out new uses for the language, including promotion of the language through computer and video technology. Like Irish, the Hualapai language seems to be retreating from the traditional domains while it concomitantly moves into newer, more modern areas of use as language initiatives progress. Hualapai community leader Philbert Watahomigie notes that "in 1974...100% of the kids spoke Hualapai. That's changing now...We're even getting some younger adults who don't speak the language and coming back to learn Hualapai" (Watahomigie & McCarty 1994: 39). As the language base continues to erode and more and more Hualapai children come to school with English as their primary language, the bilingual/bicultural program has been required "to undertake new aims and roles" (1994: 39-40). Thus for the Hualapai, revitalization efforts have been accompanied by an alteration of the primary domain of use of the language.

For the Maori of New Zealand, formal instruction of Maori in the 'language nests' and in elementary and secondary schools has meant that "a very large number of children have learned a great deal more Maori than they would have otherwise" (Benton 1986: 64). In addition to the more than 500 pre-school "language nests", there "has been a dramatic rise in the number of schools teaching Maori" (Peddie 1991: 28). A number of schools offer complete bilingual Maori/English programs; at the secondary level the number of students learning Maori has increased exponentially; and at the university level Maori has grown in stature and importance: all six of the country's universities offer courses in Maori, several at the post-graduate level (1991: 29).

Yet, despite these school-based efforts, the drift towards English in the Maori-speaking communities continues. Somewhat paradoxically, as revitalization efforts have

intensified, and as Maori has taken on greater potency as a national symbol for New Zealand and as the number of people who identify as Maori grows (New Zealand Government (1998), actual speakers are increasingly difficult to find. Benton (1986: 65) notes that Maori speakers continued to decline in the last decade, making a Maori speaker's chances of finding a conversation partner quite slim: about one in 750. Thus, learners have few opportunities to use the language outside the classroom. As Benton notes, "some families have undoubtedly been encouraged by the new approach to the language in the school to remain Maori speaking-- others may in fact have started to use more English at home, in the belief that the school can now take care of Maori" (1986: 64). Inadvertently and unexpectedly, efforts to revitalize the Maori language seem to have possibly played a hand in shifting the primary sites of transmission and acquisition of the language.

Lastly, returning once again to the Saraguros of highland Ecuador, in many communities language revitalization efforts have dramatically altered the roles and uses of the threatened language. Two Saraguro communities, Lagunas and Tambopamba, each at different stages of Quichua loss and revitalization, provide an unusual window for glimpsing the critical changes in language use and status that accompany the language revitalization efforts. While both communities are in the process of shifting away from Quichua and towards Spanish monolingualism, the sociolinguistic situations of Tambopamba and Lagunas differ significantly. In Tambopamba, many elders and middle aged adults are fully competent speakers and regular users of the language. These adults learned Quichua as their first language, and to varying degrees have acquired Spanish as teens and adults. In Lagunas, language shift is more advanced and only a very few elder community members use Quichua as their first language; the vast majority are Spanish dominant, and many of them, Spanish monolingual.

As Garzon (1992: 63) and Rhodes (1992: 88) note, a typical pattern in language death situations is for the language to first be lost in the more public or formal contexts, and

then later slip away in the home and family domains. By this measure, both communities are well into the later stages of language loss. The decline of Quichua is more advanced, however, in Lagunas. In Lagunas, language shift has progressed so far that Spanish has come to dominate every domain: Spanish is the common language of the community, as well as the home. In Tambopamba, Spanish is used in public settings, but Quichua is still frequently spoken in home and family domains, especially by elder members. Thus, while language shift is well underway in both communities, Spanish has advanced further in Lagunas, leaking into, and indeed dominating nearly every domain in the community.

Although members of both communities have expressed deep concern over the fate of Quichua revitalization, initiatives have been more numerous, better supported, and more successful in the community of Lagunas. Presently there is a generation of young children, teens and adults who are in the process of learning Quichua as a second language through elementary and high school instruction, university course work, and self-study. This purposeful acquisition of the language has meant complicated changes for language distribution and use in the community. These are best illustrated by contrasting uses of Quichua in the community of Lagunas, where there have been a variety of ongoing revitalization initiatives at various levels, and Quichua use in Tambopamba, where efforts have not fully gotten underway outside of limited formal school instruction.

Turning first to Tambopamba, Quichua is still regularly employed in the community, especially among middle aged and elder adults for personal conversation, private discussions and humor. Quichua is the language that many older adults use exclusively in the home among family members. For these reasons, Quichua is considered instrumentally valuable, especially for use with older members, with other non-Saraguro indigenous persons, and in the company of whites.

Even though Spanish is also used regularly in the community of Tambopamba, Spanish is perceived as the language of outsiders. As community members note, for them, Spanish, is the language not of indigenous people, but of *blancos* "whites".

> Español es para formar comunicación con los hispano hablantes de Saraguro y de provincia.
> ('Spanish is for forming communication with the Hispanic speakers of Saraguro and the province.'/S/) (T 24a: 4-16-95)

> Para poder hablar así. Para cuales no quieren, no se puede con gente blanca. Rechazan a nosotros por no hablar Castellano. Ya no tanto pueden maltratar a nosotros como a los antepasados.
> ('In order to be able to speak like this. Those that don't want to, can't [speak] with white people. They reject us for not speaking Castilian. Now they can't mistreat us so much like they did our ancestors.'/S/) (T 25b: 4-18-95)

In Tambopamba, Spanish is conceptualized as the language for communicating with outsiders, while Quichua is perceived to be the language of the home and family. In Lagunas, the configuration of language use is nearly reversed. Because nearly everyone in the community learned Spanish as their first language, Spanish, not Quichua, is the language of the home, of everyday intimate conversation. As only a minority of the members are fully competent Quichua speakers, Quichua has little instrumental value in the community. However, in Lagunas Quichua is valued for symbolic reasons, for its role in representing Saraguro indigenous identity. As the president of the community explained, Quichua is critical to maintenance of indigenous identity: "[Si no usamos el Quichua] vamos a perder todo. No solamente el idioma, vamos a perder toda la concepción que tenemos como étnia." ([If we don't use Quichua] we are going to lose everything. Not only the language, we are going to lose the total conception that we have as an ethnicity. /S/) (T 17b).

These differences in language use and attitudes are most clearly contrasted by examining talk at strikingly parallel speech events in the two communities: a parent-teacher meeting. In both communities, the parent-teacher meeting was the first gathering of the academic year of teachers from the community elementary school and the parents, called for

and directed by school teachers, and held in a school classroom. In both communities, the parents and the majority of the teachers are indigenous members of the community.

Turning first to the meeting in Tambopamba, as the vignette below reveals, Quichua is the language of personal communication, while Spanish is primarily the language of formal, public interaction.

> Thirty two parents wait in the classroom for the first school meeting of the year to begin. The parents, mostly mothers and grandmothers, sit low on the small children's benches; they spin wool and chat with their neighbors in Quichua as they wait.
>
> Aval, the school director and fifth grade teacher, enters the room and takes attendance. He then reads the agenda and formally opens the meeting. The first item on the agenda is to read the minutes of the previous meeting, held just over a year ago. As all of this occurs in Spanish, I can make out snips of Quichua conversation between the mothers: "Maipitac pai causan?" ('Where does she live?'/Q/), "Mana caipichu" ('He is not here.'/Q/).
>
> The director then goes on to make announcements about elections, staffing and administrative issues, all in Spanish. Each announcement brings a chorus of hushed comments from the parents in Quichua. Some are expressing their approval or disapproval; others are translating for their less Spanish-fluent neighbors. Then the director calls each parent by name to contribute for school supplies. Parents' responses vary when their name is called. Some stand up and walk toward the front of the room to hand over the money to Aval: "Aqui estoy" ('I am here'/S/). Others remain in their seats and make arrangements to bring the money at a later date: "Yo le voy a dar mandando" ('I'll send it to you later' /S/). (FN 745: 2-22-95)

The meeting continues with a discussion of carnival celebrations and attendance and tardiness problems. For the duration of the meeting, the official exchanges take place in Spanish, while the unofficial, inter-personal conversations between the parents occur in Quichua.[7]

The Tambopamba meeting contrasts sharply with that of Lagunas. For several decades Spanish has dominated public domains for Lagunas members. As the Quichua revitalization momentum has grown, Quichua has gained ground in public and formal contexts. While rarely used in the home, Quichua is frequently employed in Lagunas, and in other parts of Saraguro for public and ceremonial purposes such as the opening of soccer tournaments, graduation ceremonies, and dance festivals and competitions. It is important

to note that often, as is the case below, the speaker or the audience does not have full command of the language, a fact which underlines the phatic use of the language.

> An hour after the appointed time, it seems that most of the parents who are attending the first meeting of the *Asociación de Padres de Familias* "Parents' Association" /S/ of the Inti Raimi school have arrived. Rosa Delia, the director of the school, opens the meeting and welcomes the parents, thanks them for coming, and apologizes for the late beginning of the meeting in Spanish. She then introduces Aurelio, who served as president of the association during the previous academic year.
>
> The president begins in Unified Quichua: "Alli tuta tucui mashicuna, taitacuna, mamacuna. Chaimanta tuta nucanchic rimanchic..." ('Good evening to all friends, fathers, mothers. Hence tonight we speak...'/Q/). He continues for a several minutes. Everyone looks a little surprised and people look around the room to check the reaction of others. He pauses and then switches to Spanish to repeat much of what he has said: "Desde años hemos hablado como padres de familia de hablar quichua en los reuniones....pero no ponemos en práctica" ('For years we have spoken as parents of speaking Quichua in the meetings... but we have not put this in practice'/S/).
>
> He goes on a bit about the importance of using and teaching Quichua in the homes and then switches back to Quichua, asking if they should elect new officials of the association (There is some concern that because only slightly over half of the parents are in attendance [15 of 23], whatever election decisions are made might be later disputed.) He pauses, waiting for a response to his proposal to hold the elections tonight. No one responds directly to him, but rather many present whisper amongst themselves in Spanish, making sense of and discussing what has been said. After a moment with no response, he repeats the question in Spanish in order to get a reaction.
>
> (FN 251, 257, 258: 11-3-94)

Later that evening the elections are held. While the formal tallying of the votes for different offices takes place in Quichua, the discussion of different candidates among the members occurs in Spanish. In Lagunas, then, Quichua is at times evoked as the language of public discourse; Spanish, in contrast, dominates intimate conversations.

The configuration of use of Spanish and Quichua in certain ways are reversed in the two communities. In Lagunas, language revitalization efforts have resulted in Quichua being brought forward for formal and symbolic use, while as discussed above, the language is generally not used in Lagunas' homes except for purposeful instruction. In Tambopamba, in contrast, official, public, and formal discourse takes place in Spanish, while the language of inter-personal communication between community and family members in many cases remains Quichua. One important and unexpected effect of language revitalization efforts in Saraguro it seems is that the threatened language is brought into

new, formal domains, while the interpersonal and familial patterns of language use remain little changed.

Like in the Hualapai, Maori, and Irish cases, the revitalization of Quichua in Saraguro has corresponded with changes in domains of use and function of the language. In particular, language revitalization efforts have accompanied important shifts in the use of the threatened language: from a variety once common for private, intimate, and familial talk to that of the public (and often political) spheres of discourse. In each of the four cases, these unexpected shifts may well have important implications for the future of the threatened language.

Fishman (1990: 16-17) stresses that at each step every revitalization effort must be assessed by the degree that it successfully re-establishes the home-family, intergenerational transmission of the language. Indeed, by this measure, few of the efforts are making substantial progress. While not clearly causally linked, increased use of the language in official and formal domains seems to correspond with decreased use in the home and family context. This fact seems even more problematic when we consider that school instruction of the threatened language in many cases has been minimally effective.

Language Revitalization and Language Death

The process of language gain, like that of language loss, entails shifts in both the language corpus and language status. Examination of how these processes compare suggests that the shifts accompanying language death and revitalization differ fundamentally. These differences are in part due to the planned and organized nature of language revitalization, in contrast to the 'natural' and unconscious nature of language death, a distinction reminiscent to that made by Ferguson (1983: 30-32) in his discussion of the differences between the study of language change (which happens naturally, without conscious intervention) and language planning (which involves initiative, organization, and often institutional planning).

While this is an important distinction, it is also a critical point that language revitalization initiatives are not simply 'undoing' what has occurred during language loss, but rather are undertaking an entirely distinct process. To fully understand this, it is necessary to briefly consider the language status and corpus changes which accompany language death.

Turning first to language status, evidence from a range of contexts suggests that language death is typically characterized by a reduction in the number of possible domains of use of the language. Often domains of use contract so that the threatened language first ceases to be used in public, formal domains, and then later withdraws from use in home and familial domains. Garzon (1992: 63), drawing on data from indigenous communities of Mesoamerica, finds that typically the language withdraws first from public spheres and later from use in the home and among family. Similarly, Rhodes also concludes that "among the last functions to go...is the function of the language of the home" (1992: 88).

Comparing these steps with those of language revitalization, it is clear that they differ markedly. Language revitalization does *not* entail the reconstruction of the former language situation domain by domain, whereby the last domain to be lost (home-family, intimate interaction) is the first to be reinstated. Language revitalization efforts, hence, typically do not (or cannot) simply undo the processes of language death. Rather, the nature of revitalization efforts seems to be that the first domains in which the language comes into (re) use are the public and formal ones.

However, when we consider the findings from one of the most thorough studies of language death, the comparison of language death and language revitalization processes becomes even more complex. Hill (1983: 265-267) reports a somewhat different pattern, finding that the process of shift from Nahuatl, an indigenous language of central Mexico, to Spanish was characterized by a replacement of an 'inside-outside split' by a 'solidarity-power' split. Initially, Spanish was perceived as an outside language used only by a limited

number of community members for communication with non-members; Nahuatl was the language of everyday interaction among members. Eventually, this division was replaced by one where Nahuatl took on a primary role as a marker of ethnic identity, while Spanish came to be used for in-group communication and attained status as the language of power and authority in the community. During this 'solidarity-power' stage, there is increased emphasis on the use of the indigenous language for public, collective and ceremonial purposes (Hill, 1983).

In examining the language revitalization process in relation to language death with references to the findings described above, it seems there are both contrasts and commonalties. In Saraguro, language revitalization initiatives in Lagunas correspond with heightened use of the language for marking identity and expressing solidarity. Only in Lagunas, where language shift has progressed further and revitalization initiatives have been more intense, is Quichua used for symbolic purposes. However, the work of Hill and Hill (1986) suggests that this situation is also typical in the final stages of language loss. It seems, then, that language distribution patterns during language revitalization are parallel to those of the late stages of language death described by Hill and Hill. Furthermore, in Tambopamba, where language loss has not progressed as far, such a 'solidarity-power' split, or symbolic, phatic use of the language does not occur. This may be the case because the process of language loss has not progressed as far (as discussed above, Spanish is still perceived to be the language of outsiders), or because initiatives have had less of an impact (as mentioned above, efforts have been much less well supported in Tambopamba). Symbolic or phatic use of the language for ethnic identification may, then, correspond with both the last stages of language loss and the early stages of language revitalization.

In terms of language corpus, there may be a very different relationship between language death and language revitalization. While language revitalization efforts typically do *not* return the language to older patterns of use in former domains in terms of language

status, it frequently does entail, to a greater or lesser extent, efforts to undo the linguistic results of intensive interaction with the contact language. To a much greater extent, at the corpus level, language revitalization *is* about attempting to return the linguistic system to what is often perceived to be its healthier former state.

Language death has been characterized as being "a set of linguistic phenomena including attrition of form through rule loss and simplification until productivity is lost" (Hill 1993: 68). It has "long been recognized that dying languages characteristically show reduction of one kind or another--or most often, of many kinds at once" (Dorian 1978: 590). More precisely, linguists and sociolinguists have documented that the corpus of the threatened language is characterized by high numbers of grammatical and lexical morphemes from the contact language (Garzon 1992: 62); erosion of the honorific and referential markers on verbs and nouns (Hill 1983: 265-266); vocabulary attrition (Craig 1992; Miller 1971; cited in Dorian 1978: 591); and reduction in number of styles in use (Dressler & Wodak-Leodolter 1977: 36-37).

Analysis of the above cases suggests that language revitalization entails the development of a standard which often differs from the local variety along two lines. First, the standard variety often has a fuller, more complex grammatical system. For example, we saw that standard Irish and unified Quichua both have grammatical systems which are substantially more complex than the local varieties. Second, the unified variety typically contains a number of different lexical items which may be more 'authentic' or less 'contaminated' by extended exposure with the contact language, but which are foreign and meaningless to local speakers. For better or worse, it seems that the process of language revitalization is, along corpus lines at least, about linguistically undoing the effects of language contact. Planners are very much engaged in the process of attempting to reinstate the language corpus to what is perceived to be its prior or original form.

It is important to add, however, that this reconstruction of the language typically occurs at the national or regional, rather than the community level. Because of this, the reconstruction of the language (through the expulsion and replacement of loan words and addition of grammatical structures, for example) does not necessarily re-create the language which was once spoken in the community. Furthermore, this reconstruction is often based more on intuition or illusion than on any real linguistic evidence. As a result, corpus planning efforts may well bring an additional hybridized or 'purified' version of the language into the community which is likely to have never existed in the region and which may not be accepted by its members.

Conclusion: Restoration or Transformation?

Like the process of language death, the process of language revitalization often entails shifts in the language's status and corpus. The process of language revitalization often results in use of the language in fundamentally different ways than in the past. The changes discussed here remind us of a distinction drawn by Bentahila and Davies (1993: 355-372) between language transformation and language restoration. Bentahila and Davies argue that language revitalization planning has two distinct possible goals: restoration or transformation of the threatened language. Advocates of restoration attempt to return the language to its previously more healthy and vital state both in terms of language form and use; proponents of transformation actively attempt to develop new roles for the language in the homes, schools, and communities. They persuasively argue that restoration oriented revitalization planners have unrealistic, even dream-like notions of restoring the language to its prior state, and that initiatives are far more likely to succeed in transforming the language's position. Bentahila and Davies suggest that language revitalization advocates are likely to have greater success adopting the transformative approach and accepting the fact that their efforts will lead to the establishment of "a new variety of the language, used in new contexts, and adopted by a new type of speaker" (371).

Changes in language status and corpus are a fundamental and inevitable part of language revitalization. This paper suggests that the process of language gain, like that of language loss, entails shifts in both the language corpus and language status, but also that the shifts accompanying language death and revitalization differ fundamentally. To ignore these facts can only serve to undermine the potential for success. Lastly, it also must be recognized that in some ways, language revitalization is a fundamentally paradoxical endeavor. The attempt to revitalize and formally instruct the threatened language is likely to have the effect of changing not only the context of its use, but its very form into something new and different. While these shifts are not in and of themselves necessarily problematic, they seem to cause unexpected tension and difficulty for language revitalization initiatives. Planners and their communities need to be aware of these probable shifts from the outset, and indeed to expect them as part of the process.[5]

Kendall A. King is an assistant professor at New York University. Her research interests include language revitalization and bilingual education policy and practice.

Professor Kendall A. King
New York University
School of Education
Department of Teaching and Learning
Multilingual Multicultural Studies
239 Green Street, East Building, Room 635Q
New York, New York 10003-6674
United States

kendall.king@nyu.edu

Summary in Spanish

Tomando de la creciente literatura sobre las iniciativas de revitalización de idioma, y de ejemplos de una iniciativa andina en particular, este trabajo busca sintetizar las transformaciones mas comunes, y posiblemente universales, de estatus y de cuerpo de idiomas que suelen atravesar los idiomas en peligro de extinción durante el proceso de revitalización de idioma. Más precisamente, este trabajo examina los frecuentemente inesperados cambios de cuerpo y de estatus que han acompañado a las iniciativas de revitalización de tres idiomas destacados por estar en peligro de extinción, como son: el Maori, el Irlandés y el Hualapai, y desarrolla el cuarto caso: los esfuerzos para revitalizar el Quichua en el sur del Ecuador. Después de explorar las semejanzas entre estos distintos contextos, se considera los contrastes y las continuidades entre los procesos de revitalización y extinción de idioma, y ultimamente, se trata sobre las implicaciones que los hallazgos de esta investigación tienen para los planificadores y defensores de la revitalización de idioma.

Notes

[1]This definition draws from Hornberger's (1994) language planning framework which integrates status planning (about uses of language), acquisition planning (about users of language), and corpus planning (about the language) with policy planning (on form) and cultivation planning (on function).

[2]As Fishman (1983) and others have suggested, the distinction between the two sub-fields is more clear in theory than in reality. While there often is a close relationship and even an interdependence between the two, as will be demonstrated below, the distinction remains a useful one.

[3]While it is typical for one written system to represent multiple spoken varieties (e.g. English and Spanish), this does preclude controversy related to the desire to have a close correspondence between written and oral versions (see Hornberger's discussion of Peruvian vowel debate in Hornberger and King, to appear).

[4]Quechua is the term used to refer to the varieties spoken in Peru, Bolivia, and parts of northern Chile; it is also the cover term for all varieties of the language. Quichua is used exclusively to refer to the Ecuadorian varieties of the language. The difference in terms stems from the differing phonological evolution of the language in Ecuador, as compared to the other countries.as compared to the other countries. In the former case, the uvular stop /q/ has been lost, and with it the lowering of the /i/ vowel to /e/ in proximity to the /q/. In part because of this, Unified Ecuadorian Quichua has only three vowels (a, i, and u).

[5]With twenty consonants and three vowels, the orthography of Quichua Unificado differs significantly from Spanish. In contrast to Spanish, Unified Quichua does not contain b, d, g, rr, x, e, o; it includes the consonants sh and ts.

[6]Transcriptions in the text are provided in their original form, in either Quichua (/Q/) or Spanish (/S/), accompanied by their English translation. The number of the tape (T) or field note (FN) and the date of the event are also provided.

[7]One exception to this was a joke called out in Quichua by one student's father. As Quichua typically is the language of humor in this and other Saraguro communities, this is not surprising (King, 1997).

[8]This paper has benifited greatly from the thoughtful comments and suggestions of Nancy Hornberger and Gordon Pradl and the research assistance of Sonia Matthews and Daisy Dominguez.

References

Advisory Planning Committee. 1986. *Irish in the Educational system: An Analysis of Examination Results*. Dublin: Bord na Gaeilge.

Belote, James, D. 1984. Changing Adaptive Strategies among the Saraguros of Southern Ecuador. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois, Illinois.

Bentahila, Abdelâli & Davies, Eirlys. 1993. Language Revival: Restoration or Transformation? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 14 (5): 355-373.

Benton, Richard A. 1986. Schools as Agents for Language Revival in Ireland and New Zealand. In Bernard Spolsky (ed.), *Language and Education in Multilingual Settings* Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Limited, 33-76.

Brandt, Elizabeth A. & Ayoungman, Vivian. 1989. Language Renewal and Language Maintenance: A Practical Guide. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 16(2): 42-77.

CONAIE. 1990. *Ñucanchic Shimi 1*. Quito: MEC; DINEIIB; CONAIE.

Cooper, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Craig, Colette G. 1992. Language Shift and Language Death: The Case of Rama in Nicaragua. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 93: 11-26.

De Fréine, Seán. 1996. Irish as a Literary Language: Past, Present, Future. In Máiréad N. Craith (ed.), *Watching One's Tongue: Issues in Language Planning*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 177-194

Dorian, Nancy. 1978. The Fate of Morphological Complexity in Language Death: Evidence from East Sutherland Gaelic. *Language* 54(3): 590-609

Dorian, Nancy. 1994. Purism vs. Compromise in Language Revitalization and Language Revival. *Language in Society* 23: 479-494.

Dressler, Wolfgang & Wodak-Leodolter, Ruth. 1977. Language Preservation and Language Death in Brittany. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 12: 31-44.

Fauchois, Anne. 1988. *El Quichua Serrano Frente a la Comunicación Moderna*. Quito: Proyecto EBI/Convenio MEC-GTZ/Abya-Yala.

Ferguson, Charles A. 1983. Language Planning and Language Change. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton, 29-40.

Fishman, Joshua. A. 1983. Modeling Rationales in Corpus Planning: Modernity and Tradition in Images of the Good Corpus. In Juan Cobarrubias and Joshua A. Fishman (eds.), *Progress in Language Planning: International Perspectives*. Berlin: Mouton, 107-118.

Fishman, Joshua. A. 1990. What is Reversing Language Shift (RLS) and How Can It Succeed? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 11(1 & 2): 5-35.

Fishman, Joshua. A. 1991. *Reversing Language Shift*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Fleras, Augie. 1989. Te Kohanga Reo: A Maori Renewal Program in New Zealand. *Canadian Journal of Native Education* 16(2): 78-88.

Nobert, Francis & Nieto Andrade, Rafeal. 1996. Stories for Language Revitalization in Nahuatl and Chichimeca. [ERIC Document 395 733].

Garzon, Susan. 1992. The Process of Language Death in a Mayan Community in Southern Mexico. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 93: 53-66.

Hill, Jane. 1983. Language Death in Uto-Aztecan. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 49: 225-276.

Hill, Jane. 1993. Structure and Practice in Language Shift. In K. Hyltenstan and A. Viberg (eds.), *Progression and Regression in Language: Sociocultural, Neurophyscholgical and Linguistic Perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 68-93.

Hill, Jane H. & Hill, Kenneth. 1986. *Speaking Mexicano*. Tucson, AZ: University of Arizona Press.

Hornberger, Nancy H. & King, Kendall A. 1996. Language Revitalization in the Andes: Can the Schools Reverse Language Shift? *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 17(6): 427-441.

Hornberger, Nancy H. & King, Kendall A. (to appear) Authenticity and Unification in Quichua Language Planning. *Language, Culture, and Curriculum*.

Hornberger, Nancy H. 1994. Literacy and Language Planning. *Language and Education*, 8(1 & 2): 75-86.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1994. Language Policy and Planning: Fundamental Issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics* 14: 3-19.

King, Kendall A. 1997. Language Revitalization in the Andes: Quichua Instruction, Use and Identity in the Saraguro, Ecuador. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Leap, William L. 1988. Applied Linguistics and American Indian Language Renewal: Introductory Comments. *Human Organization* 47(4): 283-291.

Maguire, Gabrielle. 1991. *Our Own Language: An Irish Initiative*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

McCarty, Teresa L. & Sells Dick, Galena. 1996. *Mother Tongue Literacy and Language Renewal: The Case of Navajo*. Paper presented at the World Literacy Conference. Philadelphia, PA.

Miller, Wick 1971. The Death of Language, or Serendipity among the Shoshoni. *Anthropological Linguistics* 13: 14-21.

Montaluisa Chasiquiza, Luis. O. 1992, October, 12. La Interculturalidad en la Educación. *Hoy* [CONAIE supplement], p. 1.

New Zealand Government (January 16, 1998). New Zealand government web page. (http://www.govt.nz). Author.

O'Riagáin, Pádrag. 1996. Reviving the Irish language 1983-1993: The First Hundred Years. In Máiréad N. Craith (ed.), *Watching One's Tongue: Issues in Language Planning*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 33-56.

Otto, D. E. 1982. Language Renewal, Bilingualism, and the Young Child. In R. St. Claire & William Leap (eds.), *Language Renewal Among American Indian Tribes*. Rosslyn, VA: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Paulston, Christina. B., Chen, P. C., & Connerty, M. C. 1993. Language Regenesis: A Conceptual Overview of Language Revival, Revitalization, and Reversal. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development 14*(4): 275-286.

Peddie, Roger A. 1991. Coming-- Ready or not? Language Policy Development in New Zealand. *Language Problems and Language Planning* 15(1): 23-42.

Rhodes, Richard 1992. Language shift in Algonquian. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 93: 87-92.

Shafer, Susanne. M. 1988. Bilingual/bicultural Education for Maori Cultural Preservation in New Zealand. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 9(6): 487-501.

Spolsky, Bernard. 1989. Maori Bilingual Education and Language Revitalization. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 10(2): 89-105.

von Gleich, Utta. 1994. Language Spread Policy: The Case of Quechua in the Andean Republics of Bolivia, Ecuador, and Peru. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 107: 77-113.

Watahomigie, Lucille, J. & McCarty, Teresa L. 1994. Bilingual/bicultural Education at Peach Springs: A Hualapai Way of Schooling. *Peabody Journal of Education* 69: 26-42.

Table 1

Definitions of additive, societal-level language change processes

language revival	"The act of reviving a language that was no longer used by any native speakers" (Paulston, Chen & Connerty 1993: 276).
	Reviving a language that is "no longer spoken as a vernacular" (Dorian 1994: 481).
language revitalization	"The attempt to add new forms or functions to a threatened language with the ultimate aim of increasing its uses or users" (King 1997: 11).
	"Imparting new vigor to a language still in limited use, most commonly by increased use through the expansion of domains" (Paulston, Chen & Connerty 1993: 279).
language reversal	"Assistance to speech communities whose native languages are threatened because their intergenerational continuity is proceeding negatively with fewer and fewer users or uses every generation" (Fishman 1991: 1).
	"Attempt to foster, to attain, to assist a particular language in culture content and pattern" (Fishman 1991: 17).
	"Turning about of present trends in a language" (Paulston, Chen & Connerty 1993: 281).
language renewal	"An organized adult effort to ensure that at least some members of a group whose traditional language has a steadily declining number of speakers will continue to use the language and promote its being learned by others in the group" (Otto 1982; cited in Brandt & Ayoungman 1989: 43).
	"Any set of efforts designed to remove barriers to fluency and to promote, stabilize and expand knowledge and use of language skills inside and out of community contexts" (Leap 1988: 285).

BEST COPY AVAILABLE